

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 14, 2009, has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-2 and 4-9 were pending. By the foregoing amendments, Claims 1-2 and 4-9 have been amended, and new Claims 10-11 has been added. Claims 8 and 9 have been withdrawn from consideration in response to a Restriction Requirement set forth in the Office Action. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, page 8, lines 8-12. No new matter has been introduced.

The Office Action asserts that Claims 8 and 9 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed and thus under a restriction requirement is proper. In response, the Applicants elects Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 10 for examination without traverse.

The Applicants thank the Examiner Nguyen for his courtesy extended to the Applicant's Representative during a telephone interview conducted on July 10, 2009. The interview summary has been incorporated in this Amendment.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,781,990 to Seider et al. ("Seider") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,347,651 to Inoue et al. ("Inoue") and Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidler/Collier in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,267,385 to Okamoto et al. ("Okamoto"). It is noted that Claim 1 has been amended. To the extent that the grounds for rejection remain applicable to the currently pending claims, they are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a process for mounting a plurality of parts to a marked cable comprising feeding a cable into a cable-cutting and imprinting machine, detecting a length of the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine, marking the cable with a first information for mounting a first part of the plurality of parts on the marked cable, without cutting/stripping the cable, when detecting that a first predetermined positional length for mounting the first part has been reached, wherein the first information includes a first mounted position of the first part on the marked cable, continue feeding the cable with the first marked information to the cable-cutting and imprinting machine and marking the cable with a second information for mounting a second part of the plurality of parts on the marked cable, without cutting/stripping the cable, when detecting that a second predetermined positional length for mounting the second part has been reached, wherein the second information including a second mounted position of the second part on the marked cable, the first and second mounted positions are intermediate between opposite longitudinal ends of the marked cable, cutting the cable, by the cable-cutting and imprinting machine, to generate the marked cable when detecting that the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches a final predetermined length, and thereafter mounting the first and second parts on the first and second mounted positions marked on the marked cable according the first and second mounting information, respectively. (Emphasis added)

Regarding Claim 1, the Office Action admitted that Seidler does not cut the cable to a predetermined length, but relies on Inoue for disclosing such feature, as shown in Fig. 4 of Inoue. Applicants respectively disagree at least based on the ground that

none of the cited prior art teaches or suggests each and every elements of amended Claim 1. More particularly, none of the cited prior art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the features of “marking the cable with a first information for mounting a first part of the plurality of parts on the marked cable, without cutting/stripping the cable, when detecting that a first predetermined positional length for mounting the first part has been reached, wherein the first information includes a first mounted position of the first part on the marked cable, continue feeding the cable with the first marked information to the cable-cutting and imprinting machine and marking the cable with a second information for mounting a second part of the plurality of parts on the marked cable, without cutting/stripping the cable, when detecting that a second predetermined positional length for mounting the second part has been reached, wherein the second information including a second mounted position of the second part on the marked cable, the first and second mounted positions are intermediate between opposite longitudinal ends of the marked cable, cutting the cable, by the cable-cutting and imprinting machine, to generate the marked cable when detecting that the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches a final predetermined length, and thereafter mounting the first and second parts on the first and second mounted positions marked on the marked cable according the first and second mounting information, respectively,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

According to the claimed invention, the process for mounting a plurality of parts on a cable uses an encoder to detect the length of the cable that has been fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine. When the cable reaches a first predetermined

mounting length for mounting a first part, the cable-cutting and imprinting machine imprints the cable with information without cutting the cable. Similarly, when the cable reaches a second predetermined length for mounting a second part, the cable-cutting and imprinting machine imprints the cable with information without cutting the cable. The process cuts the cable only when a final predetermined length of the cable is reached.

During the telephone interview, the Examiner agreed that Seidler does not imprint more than one information/marking on a cable and the information is marked intermediate between opposite longitudinal ends of the cable after the cable is marked. Indeed, the purpose of Seidler is to produce a ready-for-use cable. Seidler is not a process for mounting a plurality of parts on a single unbroken cable. Further, as shown in Fig. 3, the single cable disclosed in Seidler is marked with information 18 at “terminal points” of the insulation 7 for mounting purposes. Thereafter, the cable is cut into separate pieces by using rupture joints 16 which are located just close to the information positions 18. Cut cable pieces 28, 29, 30, and 31 of respective lengths are each connected between two mating devices at their opposite ends while using the information 18. See Seidler, Figs. 4a to 4c. Thus, the information or markings 18 at terminal end positions of each cut cable piece are merely used to indicate which devices the ends of the cable are to be connected to. In other words, the claimed process of amended Claim 1 requires the marking to be used for mounting of parts to intermediate positions of an unbroken cable, while Seidler requires the marking to be used for mounting of a cut cable piece to devices at longitudinal opposite ends of the

cut piece. Thus, the claimed “mounting step” is quite different from that disclosed in Seidler.

Further, as admitted in the Office Action, Seidler notches the cable when the cable reaches a predetermined length and compresses the notched part by ultrasound or other thermal processes to make a rupture joint. The Office Action, however, cites that Inoue teaches such feature and thus, the claimed invention is obvious in view of the combination of Seidler and Inoue. Applicants disagree. Similarly to Seidler, Inoue merely marks and cuts the cable when the cable reaches a predetermined length. There are also lacks of “marking the cable with a first information for mounting a first part of the plurality of parts on the cable without cutting/stripping the cable when detecting a first predetermined positional length for mounting the first parts on the cable has been reached,” “continue feeding the cable with the first marked information to the cable-cutting and imprinting machine and marking the cable with a second information for mounting a second part of the plurality of parts on the marked cable, without cutting/stripping the cable, when detecting that a second predetermined positional length for mounting the second part has been reached,” “cutting the cable, by the cable-cutting and imprinting machine, to generate the marked cable when detecting that the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches a final predetermined length,” and thereafter mounting the first and second parts on the first and second mounted positions marked on the marked cable according the first and second mounting information, respectively,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

That is, Inoue fails to cure the deficiencies of Seidler.

At least for the reasons stated above, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established as the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, amended Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

As amended Claim 1 is allowable, Claims 2, 6, 7 and 10-11 which depend from allowable Claim 1, are likewise allowable at least due to their dependency from allowable independent claim and additional features recited therein.

Further, Okamoto fails to cure the deficiencies of Seidler and Inoue. Accordingly, Claims 4 and 5, which depend from allowable amended Claim 1, are likewise allowable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to amended Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-2, 4-7, and 10-11, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an

extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107348.00358.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX LLP



Wan-Ching Montfort
Registration No. 56,127

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

CMM/CYM